

ARTIFACT SHEET

Enter artifact number below. Artifact number is application number + artifact type code (see list below) + sequential letter (A, B, C ...). The first artifact folder for an artifact type receives the letter A, the second B, etc.. Examples: 59123456PA, 59123456PB, 59123456ZA, 59123456ZB

Indicate quantity of a single type of artifact received but not scanned. Create individual artifact folder/box and artifact number for each Artifact Type.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CD(s) containing computer program listing | |
| | Doc Code: Computer | Artifact Type Code: P |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Stapled Set(s) of Extra Color Drawings/Photographs | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: C |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CD(s) containing pages of specification | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | and/or sequence listing <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: S |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | CD(s) with content unspecified | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: U |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Microfilm(s) | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: F |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Video tape(s) | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: V |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Model(s) | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: M |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bound Document(s) | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: B |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other, description: _____ | |
| | Doc Code: Artifact | Artifact Type Code: Z |

REMARKS

The present application contains claims 1-16 and 29-34. Claims 17-28 have been cancelled, subject to their being the subject of a divisional application(s). New claims 33 and 34 have been currently added to further define the claims.

Claims 1, 2, 14, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Helmstädter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the reference does not form a *prima facie* basis for anticipation of the claims so rejected.

The claims under examination include two independent claims, namely claim 1 and claim 29.

Claim 1 contains the limitation:

a perfector including an element rotating about an axis, the element receiving the sheet and gripping the sheet simultaneously along both the leading and trailing edges thereof, which rotating element turns the sheet over and transfers the sheet, trailing edge first, towards the second impression roller.

Claim 29 contains a similar limitation, namely:

the transport system comprising a perfector that receives the sheet and grips it along both the leading and trailing edges thereof, which perfector turns the sheet over and transfers the sheet, trailing edge first, towards the second impression roller.

Neither of these limitations are present in the prior art reference to Helmstädter. In Helmstädter there is an element (16) which does hold the sheet at the same time (i.e., simultaneously) at both trailing and leading edges, however this element does not turn the sheet over and transfer the sheet, trailing edge first towards the second impression roller. In the Helmstädter patent it is element 17 which performs the reversal function using special pivoting grippers 19 to grab the trailing edge and turn it into the leading edge. In fact the Helmstädter patent refers to element 17 as "reversing drum 17." However, reversing drum grabs the sheet at only one end. Thus, the Helmstädter patent does not anticipate either of the independent claims.

Applicants submit that the rejection of others of the claims as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Helmstädter and various other patents similarly fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness. All of these rejections depend on Helmstädter to provide the element which both grips the sheet at both the leading and trailing ends and *also* reverses leading and trailing edges. Absent this teaching, the combinations do not contain all the elements of the claims.

While applicants have added a number of additional claims to further distinguish the present invention over the prior art and while at least some of the rejected claims are believed to

contain further distinguishing subject matter, argument regarding patentability of the dependent claims seems premature, in the absence of a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.

Applicants did not received a 1-page PTO-1449 form (labeled as "6" at the bottom left-hand corner), filed in a Second Supplementary Information Disclosure Statement on November 18, 2003, initialed by the Examiner in return. Applicants are resubmitting the form herewith and respectfully requesting that the items listed thereon be initialed by the Examiner to ensure that they appear on the face of the patent issuing on the present application. Applicants assume that the art has already been considered by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP §1893.03.

Applicants wish to point out that the present application is U.S. national application under 35 U.S.C. §371 of PCT Application No. PCT/IL00/00081 and is a continuation-in-part under 35 U.S.C. §111(a) of PCT Application No. PCT/IL99/00600, now U.S. Application No. 10/089,631. The present application is also a continuation-in-part under 35 U.S.C. §111(a) of U.S. Application No. 09/700,986, now U.S. Patent No. 6,608,979, and a continuation-in-part under 35 U.S.C. §111(a) of PCT Application No. PCT/IL98/00553, now U.S. Application No. 09/701,049, issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,438,352.

Applicants received a 4-page PTO-1449 form, filed in an Information Disclosure Statement on July 22, 2002, initialed by the Examiner in return. However, some items have been crossed out "since have not been provided to the PTO." Applicants are resubmitting a 1-page PTO-1449 form (labeled as "7" at the bottom left-hand corner) herewith and respectfully requesting that the items be initialed by the Examiner to ensure that they appear on the face of the patent issuing on the present application, according to the following:

1. Item 2 was cited on the PCT International Search Report. Copy of this item is not attached as it is available in the national stage file.

MPEP §609II states that *"The examiner will consider the documents cited in the international search report in a PCT national stage application when the Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicates that both the international search report and the copies of the documents are present in the national stage file"*.

2. Items 1 and 3-13 were cited by the applicants in the parent case U.S. Application No. 09/700,986, filed on November 21, 2000. Copies of these items are not attached as they are available in the parent case.

MPEP §609IA2 provides that *"The examiner will consider information which has been considered by the Office in a parent application when examining a continuation-in-part application filed under 37 CFR 1.53(b). Such information need not be resubmitted in the continuing application..."*.

Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentable and that the application is ready for allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,
Benzion LANDA, et al.



Paul FENSTER
Reg. No. 33,877

March 24, 2004
William H. Dippert, Esq.
ReedSmith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650

Tel: (212) 521-5400